8/13/71

Dear Howard,

I'll go over the enclosures with your 8/11 in odds and ends of time, but thanks for them. My immediate purpose in hasty response is to let you know that all you need do is tell me what bus to meet. I should have the draft completed by then, and I have made a carbon, but I've not read any of it and that I'll not get to before you can get here. It will be tough reading! On what you read for, add did I leave out what I should not have, can anything be cut without harm, do you question interpretations, etc. It would be helpful if you could scan the first two parts in advance, the first esp. with view to heavy cutting that will be necessary.

Belin: I can accept Sylvia's theory and that is sufficient justification. She may well be correct. I'll send her a copy of this after she gets back. She needs the change. I envy her. I have never engaged in correspondence with any of those non-innocents except with something like this in view, where I considered it possible. I have thus had the most limited correspondence with them.

No strong opinion on ABA except belief they'll not do anything not only because they wouldn't anyway but because they were part of all this, remember (PM)?

On your draft:see no need for last sentence, middle graph. And why not chide the sanctimonious bastard a bit, saying you'd never think of doing some of the thinks the Commission's lawyers did, leaving out what was uncongenial, refusing to correct an erroneous record when they knew it was in error or where they knew their own corrections would make the responses erroenous or change their context, and, without using his name, cite what he did to Mrs. Rowland (WWII) as a case in point. That's drive him up the wall, and if SM is right, why not?

I'd also point out the inconsistency in his wanting secrecy when the conditions stipulate full disclosure and his pretense that all those who do not agree with him and the others are to him "sensationalists". Lean on him! Tell him you'd never think of doing what they did with the autopsy material, suppressing all the relevant. That you'd not for a minute substitute an answer to a hypotehtical question for the answer to the real one when all the answers to that were entirely destructive of a preconception. Just do it politely....Add to above: why should he not want fullest distribution of his views to "sensationalists"? Can it be because he really lacks confidence in them, or because he fears that those who know the fact may be able to show they lack validity? Is he afraid of being caught in what some of his former associates were? Include his omission of Bowley, just leave his name out. Needles, man, not hugs, if SM's analysis is right. Ask him how come the spectro is suppressed when the meaningless tests are flaunted (pubic hairs-and ask him to justify this oone). To explain why it is "sensationalost" to point out that the only qualified witness on the spectrography was never asked about it and why others, who specified their legal incompetence, were asked, after they so stipulated. Or why the Markham-police relationship was not used when she was so vulnerable to their pressure. Or whey the Cuban abgle in the Warren Reynolds shooting (his territory) was not explored. Why Adams left without any aptticipation? The Fifth Amendment and Marina as a witness. The federal leaning on her, real threats and real bribes. Why nothing was done about the Odio story until too late. Why none of the shooting or ballistics tests is faithful when they could have been. Inshort, I suggest giving him what he asked for, including Carolyn Arnold, and lethim cut off if he wants to,with a record you can use and he cannot.

Rushed,